

PATENT
DOCKET NO. 00100.03.0004REMARKS

Applicant respectfully traverses and requests reconsideration.

Claims 1-3, 5, 8 and 21 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent Number 6,802,010 to Kim et. al. ("Kim"). Claims 4, 6, 9-10, 12-20, 22 and 24 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kim.

Claims 10, 16 and 21 have been amended. No new matter is believed to have been added by way of the aforementioned amendments.

Independent Claims

As to claim 1, Applicant respectfully submits that the Examiner has failed to give any meaning to the adjective "peripheral" as used in the claim term "peripheral component." Similarly, the Examiner has failed to give any discernable meaning to the phrase "capable of receiving a peripheral component" as used in the claim phrase "each of the plurality of ports capable of receiving a peripheral component for communication" The claim expressly requires a remote connector that comprises, among other things, "a plurality of ports, each of the plurality of ports capable of receiving a peripheral component for communication with a remote processing unit." Because the pending Office action fails to consider or give any meaning to several claim terms, the rejection is improper and must be withdrawn.

Page 3 of the Office action provides the following rejection with respect to the above-state claim requirements.

A plurality of ports (ports connecting to [keyboard controller] 385, [PCI-ISA bridge] 345 and wireless [signal]) each of the plurality of ports capable of receiving a peripheral component (GPIO, Keyboard, 400' are peripheral components that communicate with CPU 325)

PATENT
DOCKET NO. 00100.03.0004

Pages 9-10 of the Office action appears to provide further clarification with respect to the above-cited rejection. Relevant statements from these pages of the Office action are restated below.

[The] elements ([PCI-ISA bridge] 345, [keyboard controller] 385, [remote control] 400' and [remote control] 400'') are connected to [wireless receiving panel] 380 through ports. Therefore, [wireless receiving panel] 380 has plural ports to connect PCI-ISA bridge] 345, [keyboard controller] 385, [remote control] 400' and [remote control] 400''. Keyboard controller 385 and bridge 345 are separate from [wireless receiving panel] 380. But they are connected to [wireless receiving panel] 380. Thus, [wireless receiving panel] 380 has ports to connect to [keyboard controller] 385 and [PCI-ISA bridge] 345. As [PCI-ISA bridge] 345 and [keyboard controller] 385 are connected to peripheral components such as [hard disk drive] 350 and [keyboard] 100, ports of [wireless receiving panel] 380 are capable of receiving peripheral components [hard disk drive] 350 and [keyboard] 100 via PCI-ISA bridge] 345 and [keyboard controller] 385 to communicate with CPU 325, the remote processing unit.

Examiner understands that 382 is a wireless receiver. The [wireless receiving] panel 380 comprises necessary interfaces to receive wireless signal. A port is an interface. If [wireless receiving panel] 380 does not have necessary interfaces, [remote control] 400' and [remote control] 400'' cannot communicate with [wireless receiving panel] 380. Thus, [wireless receiving panel] 380 has plural ports, or interfaces to receive the signal from [remote control] 400' and [remote control] 400''. (Emphasis added).

Examiner considers [remote control] 400 as remote device. The two peripheral components are [remote control] 400' and [remote control] 400''. Thus there are plural components besides [remote control] 400.

As best understood by Applicant, the Office action is identifying the PCI-ISA bridge 345 and keyboard controller 385, remote control 400', remote control 400'', hard disk drive 350 and keyboard 100 as peripheral components. The Office action appears to identify any interface as a port. The Office action's rationale appears to be that the wireless receiving panel 380 is

PATENT
DOCKET NO. 00100.03.0004

illustrated in Figures 5 and 8 of Kim as being coupled to each of these devices. Therefore, and according to the Office action, there must be some "interface" that connects the wireless receiver to each of the PCI-ISA bridge 345 and keyboard controller 385, remote control 400', remote control 400" hard disk drive 350 and keyboard 385. This characterization flatly ignores the claim term "peripheral" and the claim phrase "capable of receiving a peripheral component".

As illustrated in Kim's FIG. 5 by the dotted line referenced by computer system 300, the computer system 300 includes each of the PCI-ISA bridge 345, the keyboard controller 385, and hard disk drive 350 as internal components of the computer system 300. In fact, Kim appears to admit as much in column 5, line 59 – column 6, line 5 and in column 7, lines 19-30 (explaining that computer system 300 has a hardware layer 600 that includes the keyboard controller 385). It is further noted that the wireless receiving panel 380 (having wireless receiver 382) is also an internal component of the computer system 300. (FIGS. 1, 5 and 8; Col. 6, ll. 9-14; Col. 7, ll. 19-30). Thus, each of the PCI-ISA bridge 345, the keyboard controller 385, hard disk drive 350, and wireless receiving panel 380 are internal and not peripheral components of the computer system 300. To contend otherwise and suggest that some of the aforementioned internal computer structures/components are peripheral components, as alleged by the current Office action, affords absolutely no meaning to the claim term "peripheral" and would have the effect of characterizing every component of every computer system a peripheral component. This clearly cannot stand. One having ordinary skill in the art would readily understand that none of the PCI-ISA bridge 345, the keyboard controller 385 and hard disk drive 350 as described and illustrated by Kim are peripheral components.

With respect to the allegation that the remote control 400' and remote control 400" are peripheral components capable of being received by the plurality of ports of the remote

PATENT
DOCKET NO. 00100.03.0004

controller, Applicant notes that each of the remote control 400' and remote control 400'' communicate with the wireless receiving panel 380 using wireless signals. (FIG. 5). The reference is replete with this characterization. In fact, the Office action even admits that "Thus, [wireless receiving panel] 380 has plural ports, or interfaces to receive the signal from [remote control] 400' and [remote control] 400''". (Page 9, emphasis added). The claim, however, expressly states that the plurality of ports must be capable of receiving a peripheral component. Applicant submits that a port being capable of receiving a peripheral component is not the same as a panel receiving a wireless signal as suggested by the current Office action. To suggest otherwise would ignore and give no meaning to the claim phrase "receiving a peripheral component". Therefore, neither the remote control 400' nor the remote control 400'' as wirelessly coupled to the wireless receiving panel 380 teach or suggest the above claim limitation.

With respect to the keyboard 100, FIG. 5 and column 6, lines 31-65 appears to teach that keyboard 100 is coupled to the Super I/O 360 by signal line 365. "The signal line 365 is a keyboard clock connected to a keyboard 100, and a data line." (Col. 6, ll. 47-49). Nothing in the reference or in the Office action teaches or suggests that the keyboard 100 is received by a plurality of ports of a remote connector. Instead, the reference only appears to teach and suggest that "the panel 280 receives a wireless signal from a remote control 400, and inputs a power control signal for converting the system status into a power-on or a sleep mode to the PCI-to-ISA bridge 345 through a signal line 375." (Col. 6, ll. 34-38). And, as discussed above, the remote controls 400-400'' are not equivalent to the claimed peripheral components that are received by a plurality of ports of a remote connectors. Thus, the Office action's contention that the keyboard

PATENT
DOCKET NO. 00100.03.0004

100 is equivalent to the claimed peripheral components that are received by a plurality of ports of a remote connectors is also incorrect.

For the above stated reasons, none of the PCI-ISA bridge 345 and keyboard controller 385, remote control 400', remote control 400'', hard disk drive 350 and keyboard 385 are peripheral components that are capable of being received by each of a plurality of input ports of the remote connector for communication with a remote processing unit. Thus, for at least this reason, claim 1 appears to be in proper condition for allowance.

Each of independent claims 10, 16 and 21 contain the same or similar language as presented above with respect to claim 1. Thus, for at least this reason, claims 10, 16 and 21 are believed to be allowable.

In addition, claim 10 has been amended to expressly require that the remote connector has a power supply input receiver operably coupled to a first power source and being capable of receiving a first power supply for powering the remote connector and that the remote processing unit is operably coupled to a second power source and is capable of receiving a second power supply for powering the remote processing unit. Kim, in contrast, appears to teach a single power source that supplies power to the whole of the computer system 300. For example, FIG. 8 illustrates a single power supply 390 that is part the hardware layer 600 of computer system 300. (Col. 7, ll. 20-35). The computer system 300 also includes the CPU 325 (alleged by the Office action to be equivalent to the claimed remote processing unit) and the wireless receiving panel 380. (FIGS. 1 and 5; Col. 5, l. 59 – Col. 6, ll. 14). In fact, the Office action appears to acknowledge that the computer system 300 as a whole (including CPU 325 and wireless receiving panel 380) has a single, independent power source so that the computer system may “work on its own, instead of depending on other outside power source.” (Page 6). Because

PATENT
DOCKET NO. 00100.03.0004

claim 10 contains limitations that are neither taught or suggested by Kim, Claim 10 appears to be in proper condition for allowance.

Claims 16 and 21 contain the same or similar limitations as discussed in claims 1 and 10 above and are therefore also believed to be allowable over Kim.

Dependent Claims


Claims 2-6, 8-9, 11-15, 17-20, 22 and 24 are dependent upon allowable claims 1, 10, 16 and 21, respectively. Applicant respectfully submits that the dependent claims add additional novel and non-obvious subject matter. For at least these reasons, the aforementioned claims are also believed to be in proper condition for allowance.

Applicant respectfully submits that the claims are in condition for allowance and respectfully request that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case. The Examiner is invited to contact the below listed attorney if the Examiner believes that a telephone conference will advance the prosecution of this application.

Date: December 4, 2007

Vedder, Price, Kaufman & Kammholz, P.C.
222 North LaSalle Street, Suite 2600
Chicago, Illinois 60601
phone: (312) 609-7599
fax: (312) 609-5005

Respectfully submitted,

By: 
Christopher J. Reckarap
Registration No. 34,414